

# ***EXHIBIT 1***

# ***EXHIBIT 1***

**From:** Rachael Meny <RMeny@keker.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 24, 2017 3:12 PM  
**To:** Hyde, Hayes  
**Cc:** Vu, Hong-An; Chatterjee, Neel  
**Subject:** RE: Amended Subpoena

Hyde:

If KVP is ordered to provide a 30(b)(6) witness regarding the August 21, 2017 subpoena, KVP plans to put Tom Gorman up as that witness. Thus, any separate subpoena to Mr. Gorman is duplicative and unnecessary.

Please agree that this removes any need to further discuss a subpoena to Mr. Gorman individually.

Thanks

Rachael

---

**Rachael Meny**

Keker, Van Nest & Peters LLP  
633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
415 676 2245 direct | 415 391 5400 main  
rmeny@keker.com | [vcard](#) | keker.com

---

**From:** Hyde, Hayes [<mailto:HHyde@goodwinlaw.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 23, 2017 5:59 PM  
**To:** Rachael Meny  
**Cc:** Vu, Hong-An; Chatterjee, Neel  
**Subject:** RE: Amended Subpoena

Rachel,

While we disagree with your reading of Judge Corley's order, I can amend the subpoena with a date that works for Mr. Gorman and the lawyer who would represent him. Please let me know that date.

**Hayes Hyde**



Goodwin Procter LLP  
3 Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
o +1 415 733 6044  
f +1 415 390 7975  
[HHyde@goodwinlaw.com](mailto:HHyde@goodwinlaw.com) | [goodwinlaw.com](http://goodwinlaw.com)

**From:** Rachael Meny [<mailto:RMeny@keker.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 23, 2017 5:53 PM  
**To:** Hyde, Hayes  
**Cc:** Vu, Hong-An; Chatterjee, Neel  
**Subject:** RE: Amended Subpoena

Hayes:

So it is clear, my understanding was that I was checking on a date and that we agreed I could provide you with a new date after the stipulation was filed.

As to the attached, revised subpoena, August 31<sup>st</sup> does not work for Tom Gorman or the lawyer who would represent him. Thus his deposition (if it is ordered) needs to be no earlier than September 1<sup>st</sup>, starting in the afternoon.

I'll note that I think Judge Corley's recent order may preclude serving any new subpoena on Mr. Gorman. Even if I accept a subpoena with a new date, we are reserving the right to make that argument and I assume you are reserving the right to oppose our argument.

Thanks

Rachael

---

**Rachael Meny**

Keker, Van Nest & Peters LLP  
633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
415 676 2245 direct | 415 391 5400 main  
[rmeny@keker.com](mailto:rmeny@keker.com) | [vcard](#) | [keker.com](http://keker.com)

---

**From:** Hyde, Hayes [<mailto:HHyde@goodwinlaw.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 23, 2017 3:40 PM  
**To:** Rachael Meny  
**Cc:** Vu, Hong-An; Chatterjee, Neel  
**Subject:** Amended Subpoena

Hi Rachael,

Attached please find the Amended Notice of Subpoena of Thomas Gorman. Per our conversation yesterday, I had agreed to wait to serve this until after you confirmed an amenable date and you stated you would accept service to a date after August 24; I understand that Jim Baker of Quinn Emmanuel had also reached out to you to find an amenable date.

The stipulation regarding depositions after August 24 was filed this morning. Please confirm you will accept service of the attached with the revised date.

**Hayes Hyde**



Goodwin Procter LLP  
3 Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
o +1 415 733 6044  
f +1 415 390 7975

[HHyde@goodwinlaw.com](mailto:HHyde@goodwinlaw.com) | [goodwinlaw.com](http://goodwinlaw.com)

\*\*\*\*\*

This message was sent from Goodwin Procter LLP and is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*